DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 913 IR 054 499

AUTHOR Kozup, Peter C.
TITLE Major Issues in Prison Librarianship: A Case Study of Three Libraries.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 70p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; Case Studies; Censorship; *Correctional Education; Interviews; *Librarians; Library Materials; Library Personnel; Library Role; Library Services; Personality Traits; Prisoners; *Prison Libraries; Questionnaires; Selection; *Users (Information)

ABSTRACT

Three prison librarians were interviewed about the ways they handle major issues in their libraries. Two of the three librarians were females and one was male; one was Caucasian, one was Afro-American, and one was of Asian descent. A case study approach was used to examine their methods. Issues examined included: (1) materials selection and acquisition, including the matter of censorship; (2) the use of inmate staff in the libraries, including selection, training, and evaluation; and (3) the provision of library service to inmates, including access to the library, library-based programs for inmates, and outreach services for inmates unable to go to the library. Results indicate that librarians vary in the ways they handle these matters; and that many things influence them, such as the impact of the prison administration and staff, the physical space available for the library, civilian staffing availability, the type and number of prisoners in the institution, and even the personality of the librarian. The questionnaire for librarians and a 44-item bibliography are included. (Contains 21 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED354913

MAJOR ISSUES IN PRISON LIBRARIANSHIP: A CASE STUDY OF THREE LIBRARIES

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University
School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree Master of Library Science

by

Peter C. Kozup

November, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peter C. Kozup

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR054499

ABSTRACT

In this study three prison librarians are interviewed on the ways they handle major issues in their libraries. A case study approach is used to examine the ways these librarians deal with those issues. The issues examined include materials selection and acquisition, including the matter of censorship; the use of inmate staff in the libraries, including their selection, training, and evaluation; and the provision of library service to inmates, including inmate access to the library, library-based programs for inmates, and the provision of outreach services to inmates who are unable to go to the library. The study concludes that the librarians vary in the way they handle these matters, and that many things influence them -- especially the impact of the prison administration and staff, but also including things such as the physical space available for the library, civilian staffing available, the type and number of prisoners in the institution, and even the personality of the librarian.

Master's Research Paper by

Peter C. Kozup

B.A., Ohio University, 1964

M.Ed., Kent State University, 1968

Grad. Dip. Lib., Riverina C.A.E. (Australia), 1985

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1992

Approved by

Adviser_____Date_____

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

This author would like to thank the three unnamed librarians interviewed in this study for their time, candor, and advice -- without their assistance this study would not have been possible. The assistance of Mr. Phil Koons of the State Library of Ohio is also acknowleged and appreciated.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	ACKNOWLEGEMENTS	iii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	2
	Limitations of the Study	2
II.	SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE	3
III.	METHODOLOGY	9
IV.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	12
	Materials Selection / Acquisition	12
	Budget and ordering	12
	Determining needs and interests	16
	Censorship of materials	19
	Use of Inmate Staff in the Library	24
	Selection / deployment of staff	24
	Training of inmate staff	29
	Evaluation of inmate staff	32
	Library Services to Prisoners	35
	Inmate access to the library	36
	Library sponsored programs	44
V.	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	50
	APPENDIX	55
	REFERENCES	59
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The average librarian, to say nothing of the average person in the greater society, probably knows little about prison libraries and the role of the librarian in those libraries. Many people would not realize that most prisons contain such a library to serve the prison inmates, and that these are staffed by a professional librarian. Yet, such libraries do exist in most prisons, funded, staffed, and presumably with goals that are not disimilar to those of most other libraries. While there are undoubtedly many similarities between the prison library and other libraries, it is also probable that there are major differences due to the nature of prisons. The literature on the subject indicates a number of major issues that permeate the field of prison librarianship. One of these is the policy towards materials selection and acquisition, including the thorny issue of censorship of inmates' reading materials. Another is that of inmate staffing in the library, including their selection, training, and assessment. A third issue is services to inmate patrons, including inmate access to the library, library sponsored activities, and "outreach" services to prisoners who are unable to come to the library for security or other reasons.

These three issues are matters of serious concern for prison librarians. They are issues that must be dealt with, and for anyone interested in this field in Ohio it would be of considerable interest to see how working librarians handle these issues on a daily basis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to study and describe the ways that librarians in the institutions under investigation deal with the three major issues of materials selection, inmate staffing of the library, and inmate access to the library. By investigating the work of three different librarians in three different prison settings it is possible to arrive at a view of just how these matters are handled, and provide the reader, or researcher, with valuable insight into the means of dealing with some significant issues in prison librarianship.

Limitations of the Study

The paper is limited in scope. Its format is a case study of three different prison libraries and the ways librarians in those facilities handle the issues under investigation. Three different librarians in three different institutions do not provide results that can easily be generalized into an overall conclusion, but they do give three different ways of looking at and coping with some significant issues for prison librarians.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

The literature on prison librarianship indicates that the three issues to be investigated in this paper are major concerns to prison librarians, and that each is fraught with difficulties unique to the corrections situation with which librarians must cope. Library literature is not full of works on prison librarianship. There has been an average of only about twelve citations per year in Library Literature dealing with prison libraries over the past forty years, according to Fred Hartz in his extremely useful work Prison Librarianship: A Selective, Annotated, Classified Bibliography, 1945-85.[1] While this is not a significant number considering the amount published yearly on librarianship in general, it does indicate that it is possible to locate material on the subject. Specifically, with regard to the issues being investigated in this paper, there has been a reasonable amount written, and the issues have been identified in the literature.

Several areas of concern can be identified with regard to collection development, materials selection, and censorship in prison libraries. The matter of the ethnic and racial makeup of the inmate populations of most prisons is one that must be identified and dealt with in materials

selection. The large number of Black and Hispanic inmates makes selection of materials aimed at those populations important. Barbara Haymann-Diaz has written specifically about selection of materials for ethnic collections in prisons, and she argues that it is important that the practical experience of ethnic inmates be utilized in the selection process.[2] Jay Ihrig makes the point that through their selection of materials and resources prison librarians can have an impact on the ability of Hispanic inmates to solve many of their unique problems in the prison environment.[3] An excellent view of the problems that prison librarians encounter in the selection of materials can be found in an article by Darby Penney. Penney's view is that before the selection process can begin the librarian must know his patron population, the various programs being offered to inmates at the institution, and what special interest groups might need to be catered to.[4] There are several suggested bibliographies of books useful in a prison situation. Penney's article contains such a list. In addition, a very interesting bibliography is one compiled by David Allen Coe, a country music singer who has spent time in prison, and Christine Kirby, a former prison librarian who embellishes Coe's list with additional subjects of interest to inmates.[5]

The subject of censorship is close to the hearts of prison librarians, and a matter that causes them frustration and concern. It is also a subject that is at the heart of

material selection and collection development policy. Writers on the subject have maintained that the guidelines under which materials are censored are vague or even nonexistent, and that librarians have little say in what materials should or should not be included in the libraries they run. According to Michael Sawyer censorship is a subject in prisons that "appears to have caused more headaches to prison librarians than any other issues that confront them."[6] Sawyer has taken an in-depth look at the problem, realizing that some censorship is necessary in the prison situation, while at the same time being critical of the way censorship guidelines are implemented. Sheldon Krantz describes the litigation that has questioned the ability of prison authorities to censor what prisoners read and the problems of guidelines that are not clear.[7]

Prison librarians deal with prisoners, and that fact is one of the things that makes the prison librarian's job unique among his or her colleagues. The successful prison librarian must develop some knowledge about prison life and about the ways criminals can be expected to behave. There is considerable literature on the subject of the criminal mind that should give some insight into the way that mind works. Such insight is crucial for librarians who not only need to deal with inmates as patrons, but also as staff employees. Two general works stand out. The first is Stanton Samenow's Inside the Criminal Mind which gives a different view of the causes of criminal behavior, and includes a blueprint for

changing that behavior.[8] Malin Akerstrom's empirical study of Swedish male prisoners and their lifestyles gives a similar view of the criminal mind to that of Samenow, and the more scientific approach used makes it very worthwhile reading. Although it concerns Swedish prisons it contains much that can be applied to the American scene.[9] A very useful view of the way inmates relate to prison staff can be gained from Stephen Mallinger's article "Games Inmates Play," which describes the manipulative nature of prisoners and the means that corrections staff can use to counter that manipulation.[10] Surprisingly, not much has been found regarding the use of prison inmates as staff in prison libraries. This is somewhat surprising in light of the virtually universal use of prison inmate staff to serve as clerical staff in prison libraries. The use of inmates is mentioned in a few articles, including Cornelia Holbert's "Feet Off the Circulation Desk," in which she points out the danger of the circulation desk becoming a source of power for the inmate library assistant.[11] The American Correctional Association's Standards for Adult-Correctional Institutions contains a section dealing with inmate library assistants which is useful.[12] One Canadian program for using university library courses as training for prison inmate library assistants is described in two articles appearing in the Canadian Library Journal. One article was written by Joanne Lefebvre[13] and the other by Joanne Locke and Anne Galler.[14]

The public library model is the generally accepted model for prison libraries, and though there are a few who would have things different (see William Coyle's book Libraries in Prisons: A Blending of Institutions for a different view of the purposes of prison libraries[15] the vast majority of prison librarians subscribe to the view that libraries in corrections facilities should cater to the overall information needs of inmates. Thus, there exists in prison libraries a wide variety of service options. There is also much written on this subject. Donald Drewett presents an overview of the areas of concern when planning library programs for prisons. In his article Drewett emphasizes the need to create an atmosphere suitable for such programs, and part of that atmosphere is the attitude of the librarian and the inmates' perceptions of the librarian.[16] Another article that discusses general library programming in prisons is that of Jane Pool. Pool proposes programs for libraries that relate to education and vocational training, and re-entry resources and programs.[17] There are a number of articles that describe actual programs implemented in prison library situations. One of the most interesting is that of Myra Albert in which she describes a month long series of sixteen library programs which covered a wide range of topics and formats, and which were designed to appeal to a wide range of inmates, including non-users of the library.[18] The A.L.A. publication Jail Library Service has a section dealing with services to inmates which outlines a wide variety of

services to the entire prison population. This is virtually a "how to" manual for providing jail library service. While not aimed specifically at prisons, there is much useful information that applies to prison situations.[19]

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive paper, and its objective is to describe the ways that selected prison librarians in different types of prisons handle certain common issues. Data have been collected by interviewing prison librarians in three different correctional institutions about the ways they deal with the issues under investigation. An interview schedule of the questions asked is included in Appendix A.

As described above, this paper is a case study of the way three different librarians in three different types of prison library deal with the issues of materials selection and acquisition (including censorship of materials), the selection, use, and evaluation of inmate staff in the library, and inmate access to the library and library programs for inmates. It is not intended that this study should yield generalizations about the ways librarians handle these issues; it is not possible to generalize about these issues from the limited sampling used.

The responses from the librarians are described in the text, but it should be noted that no attempt has been made to compare the three libraries in any way from the information gained from the interviews. This is not intended to be a comparative study, and it is not appropriate to compare the

libraries due to the differing types of institutions and inmate patrons being surveyed. The libraries and the individuals studied vary greatly. In light of this great care has been taken to ensure the confidentiality of both the librarians and their libraries in order to avoid any ramifications.

In order to avoid ramifications either from other professional librarians or from corrections officials, it was decided to maintain the anonymity of the librarians and their prisons. It should be noted, however, that the librarians and prisons selected for this study were chosen, at least partly, to get as much diversity as possible in the sampling. Thus, two of the three librarians are females, one male. One is Caucasian, one Afro-American, the third of Asian descent. One has served in an institutional library for almost ten years, a second for about four years, and the third for only about one year. Of the prisons in which these librarians serve, one is an institution for women, two are insitutions for men. One is a long-term facility, one a short-term one, and the third is a facility which is primarily short-term, but with a percentage of prisoners who are there for the long-term. One of the institutions is considered minimum security, one maximum security, and the third contains a variety of types of prisoners, which makes it a maximum or closed security facility, but with a number of inmates whose crimes are less severe. One is located in the far north of the state, one near Columbus, and the third between Cleveland and Columbus.

It is expected that the diversity in both the librarians and the libraries selected will have a beneficial effect on this study.

Each librarian was mailed a copy of the questions to be asked at least one week prior to the interview. The questions were asked as they appeared on the interview schedule, and the interviewer wrote down the answers to the questions as the interviewees stated them. No responses were taped. The interviewer was careful not to lead the questionning in order to solicit unbiased and accurate responses.

Each issue was dealt with separately, and no attempt is made to tie them together to get an overall profile of the institutions involved in this study. The study focuses on the issues, not on the institutions, and therefore the emphasis is to ascertain how the issues are handled in different prison libraries.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Materials Selection and Acquisition

Budget and ordering. In this age of shrinking resources it is reasonable to expect that prison librarians would also be feeling the pinch of insufficient funding to run their libraries efficiently. That many prison libraries do suffer from insufficient funding is an assumption that might be made in this day of economic restraint. The librarians interviewed in this study were asked four questions dealing with their budgets in order to ascertain whether they, in fact, did receive a budget, the amount of money allocated to their library, the sources of any funding received, and whether or not they felt that the funding was sufficient.

As might be expected, all three librarians stated that they receive an allocation of money from the prison authorities with which to run their libraries. The arrangements are informal, with librarians submitting a proposed list of needs and expenditures each year and the prison administration responding. Two of the three librarians indicate that the prison authorities are supposed to allocate a per capita amount each year to provide books and materials -- to the amount of ten books per inmate. As one librarian

stated, however, most prisons would find this an impossible goal. In the three libraries being studied the monies provided are not derived from prison funds, but from other inmate-generated sources. All three libraries are funded primarily from the prison's Industry and Entertainment account. This I & E account, as it is called, includes money raised from inmates and inmate activities within the prison, including the sale of craft items, money raised from activities such as bake sales to prisoners, and from commissary sales. In addition, the prison receives a rebate of money spent by inmates on long distance telephone calls, and in each of the prisons studied a portion of that money is allocated to the prison library.

Because the libraries studied in this paper receive substantial funding from these inmate-generated sources, the libraries are evidently well funded. Each of the librarians interviewed stated that funding for his/her library is adequate, in fact, more than adequate. One of the librarians stated that the library received over $70,000 in 1991/92. A second gave a figure of about $44,000 for the same year, while the third quoted the amount of $31,000 (and added that only a bit over half of that amount was actually spent). This optimistic view of the financial situation of these prison libraries is somewhat surprising. It appears that, for the three libraries studied in this paper, at least, inmate-generated money has a very beneficial effect on their financial situation.

In addition to this Industry and Entertainment money each of the libraries studied receives additional money from grants for specific purposes. One of the libraries is in a new institution, and received a $10,000 establishment grant from LSCA funds, all of which was allocated for the purchase of books. The other two institutions received LSCA grants for automation of their libraries.

This study makes the attempt to ascertain the restrictions placed on librarians in the selection and ordering of materials. Those interviewed were asked what restrictions were placed on the ordering of materials in terms of how often orders can be (and are) placed, what restrictions exist on the number of times each year that orders can be placed, what restrictions or guidelines exist on places from which materials can be ordered, and who imposes those restrictions. It appears that there is little restriction placed on the actual ordering of materials by the three librarians interviewed. There are certain bureaucratic guidelines which must be followed, but these are not unlike similar guidelines that are found in public or academic libraries. All three individuals indicated that they are free to place orders for materials whenever and as often as they wished. However, they all indicated that orders over $300 require budget office and Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections approval. One librarian indicated that orders for less than that amount are filled more quickly.

A registered vendor list exists, and librarians are expected to place orders through these vendors unless some extraordinary situation exists -- for example, if a non-registered vendor is the sole source of an item. Similarly, if an order is placed for over $300 from a vendor not on state contract, the librarian must obtain three quotes and select the lowest quoted price. It was also pointed out by one of the librarians that not only is it easier to place orders with vendors on state contract, but often these purchases result in considerable savings to the library over the non-contract price.

The librarians within the three institutions studied have all indicated that funding for their libraries is adequate. This is due primarily to their receipt of inmate-generated funds, particularly from the prison's Industry and Entertainment account. All three librarians have indicated that they suffer no severe restrictions on their ordering procedures, aside from the fact that they are obligated to purchase from vendors with state contracts whenever possible. Within certain bureaucratic guidelines, however, they are able to purchase resources when they wish and as often during the year as they wish. All three librarians interviewed expressed displeasure at bureaucratic entanglements in the ordering process that can be described as nuisances. One librarian, for example, stated that orders placed and materials received tend to sit on the desks of certain prison administrators, sometimes for quite awhile.

Another indicated that some guidelines appear not to have been well thought out and are, therefore, difficult to follow. For example, librarians have been told to "buy Ohio" whenever possible, yet few of the vendors on state contract are Ohio companies.

Determining needs and interests. The interviewees were questioned about the methods they use to determine the reading/information needs and interests of their patrons. Questions were asked about how the selection of resources to be purchased is made, about how the reading and information needs and wants of inmate patrons are determined (including questions on the use of surveys), and about input on materials selection sought from members of the prison community besides inmates (e.g., teachers and corrections officers).

When determining what resources to purchase, all three librarians rely heavily on observation and direct contact with inmate patrons. They take requests ad hoc, by word of mouth, and observe the sorts of materials that patrons request. This very informal method is the most heavily used method of determining which subjects or topics to buy. All three librarians placed this at or near the top of the ways they use to make selections of subject areas. Professional judgment is another method these three librarians use to select materials. One librarian stated that it is the librarian's job to use his/her professional expertise to select materials. In addition to their observations and their

professional judgment all three do formally survey their patrons, though the procedures used vary somewhat from library to library. Two of the librarians keep the survey forms available in the library at all times and inmate patrons fill them in as the mood or the need strikes them. These are then tabulated once or twice per year, or whenever the librarians are ordering resources. The other librarian approaches the survey more formally by setting aside a period of time once or twice a year to collect and evaluate survey forms. Regardless of the method used to ascertain the materials to be purchased for the library, it is clear that all three librarians place a very high priority on using input from inmate patrons to make that determination.

Ascertaining the reading or information needs of inmates is, of course, a different matter from ascertaining what materials inmates want in the library. Two of the librarians rely heavily on patron contact to determine those needs. One of these indicated that an attempt is made to cater to as many of the inmates' needs as can be determined, including their informational, recreational, rehabilitative, and job-related needs. This librarian obtains most of this information on an ad-hoc basis by observing and talking with inmates. The second librarian feels that it is the librarian's job to ascertain needs and select materials to fill those needs, and that while other prison staff will be listened to if they make the approach, that input is not sought out. The third librarian, however, takes a completely

different approach. This person actively seeks the input of persons such as the chaplain, recovery services personnel, and teachers to determine the needs of inmates. All three are in agreement, though, when it comes to the question of seeking input from individuals outside the institution on either determining needs of prisoners or determining which materials to buy. Little input is sought or received from individuals from outside the prison. One librarian does consult with members of the Library Advisory Committee to obtain their input on various library/inmate issues, and this sometimes does include the matters of resources for the library or ways of meeting inmate needs. However, this committee meets only twice per year and, therefore, its input is minimal. A second speaks with vendor representatives to ascertain the quality of the materials to be ordered. The third indicated that input from outside sources is neither sought nor received.

All three librarians interviewed indicated that they attempt to meet both the reading interests and the reading and information needs of their patrons when ordering resources for their libraries. The primary method used to ascertain the interests and needs of inmate patrons is observation and ad hoc discussion with patrons, though all three do use surveys to assist them in making these determinations. All three view the library as being the inmates' library, and therefore place a greater importance on requests that come from inmates as opposed to input from

either corrections staff or from sources outside the prison. In fact, only one of the librarians interviewed actively pursues input from other corrections staff in determining the needs and interests of patrons.

Censorship of materials. The issue of censorship is a major one in prison libraries. A review of the literature will find much written on this question, much of it critical of the process. The librarians were questioned on the issue of censorship in order to discover whether they understand and abide by the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's guidelines on acceptable reading materials for prison libraries, at what level of the administrative structure these policies are enforced, and the effect that these policies have on the library and the patrons using the library.

The librarians being studied know and understand the guidelines issued by the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction regarding materials acceptable for prison libraries. Each was able to describe and outline these guidelines sufficiently to make it obvious that they are aware of and understand them. Essentially the guidelines prohibit books and materials that are considered pornographic, that would incite inmates to riot or in some way cause or promote unruly conduct, or that would give inmates insight into the manufacture or design of weapons or explosives. In addition, some types of materials are prohibited in a less formal manner. For example, medical

books, especially books that diagnose or detail symptoms are generally excluded from the collection, though this does not appear in the guidelines.

It appears that the librarians under study adhere to these guidelines when ordering materials for the library. One did admit that at times the guidelines have been violated, though when this happened it was always justified. This person indicated that sometimes there is a difference in perception between what the corrections officials see as being outside the guidelines and what the librarian sees, and this can lead to some disputation. The other two librarians stated flatly that they always adhere to the guidelines when ordering. It appears that there may, at times, be additional stipulations on what materials can be ordered. For example, one librarian stated that at times the warden will set down rules which must be followed and which are beyond the departmental guidelines, but which prison officials such as the librarian must adhere to.

It appears that the impact of the censorship rules varies from one prison situation to another, and this may partly be the result of the views of the librarian working there as well as his/her relationship with the prison administrators. Two of the librarians stated that they had experienced cancellation by censors of ordered items only very rarely or not at all. One of them stated that he/she takes great care to follow the acceptability standards when ordering, and that this is probably the reason that nothing

had been cancelled. The second individual recalled an episode that occurred several years ago when some titles on an order were questioned by two of the deputy wardens, though the titles were eventually approved by the authorities. In this case the materials were questioned because it was feared that they might promote the formation of gangs amongst the inmates. The third librarian described a very different situation. This person stated that materials ordered were cancelled "all the time." This censorship of materials ordered was attributed to a deputy warden and individuals from the central office of the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections in Columbus. Previously when items were cancelled the librarian was not notified; items ordered simply did not arrive. This situation evidently occurs frequently in other prison libraries, and according to one of the librarians interviewed has resulted in an agreement in which books and materials are not supposed to be challenged until they have arrived in the institution. According to the librarian who has had materials cancelled, though, this agreement is often not adhered to and certain institutions continue to suffer from cancellation of ordered items without the librarian being notified of the action and before they are actually viewed by the authorities.

The impact of censorship upon the prison library and the librarian in the minds of the three librarians interviewed ranges from great to minimal, and to some extent this reflects the librarian's perception regarding the

cancellation of materials by the corrections officials. The librarian who feels that materials ordered are often cancelled by individuals in the prison hierarchy also feels that the policy of censoring materials has a great impact upon the work of the library. This person feels that the policy of restricting access to certain materials impacts upon the thinking of the inmates, resulting in the curtailment of human rights, and is a certain psychological dilemma both for the inmates and the librarian. This person also pointed out that knowing that materials might be cancelled from orders is time consuming because it means that the librarian, when ordering, has to give great consideration to whether or not items being considered will, in fact, pass the censors. This sentiment was also expressed by one of the other two librarians who went on to say that the censorship of materials caused a re-think of the use of Inter-Library Loan. Some things that had been ordered through ILL had sat on a desk for a considerable period of time while a prison official considered whether or not they were suitable for inmate use. The third librarian indicated that there is minimal or no impact upon his/her work. In fact, this librarian expressed the view that the policy is less than stringent, and that its effect was minimal.

However, all three librarians agreed that there is some effect upon the patrons, though, again, the perception of the impact of that effect varies from librarian to librarian. One saw it as minimal though present. This person

feels that a few more people would use the library if censorship did not exist and they could obtain whatever they want. A second viewpoint is that because inmate patrons can not obtain some materials they want that they experience a cooling of their interest. The third feels quite strongly that when inmates can not get what they want from the library they tend to become frustrated and angry, and that at times they take this out on the librarian.

It is easy to discern from the reactions to the interview questions that the three librarians hold differing views on the censorship of materials in prisons. One of them stated that "I am not opposed to a certain amount of censorship as it pertains to maintaining a level of security in the institution." A second indicated that there are concerns chiefly because of the impact on things like Inter-Library Loans. The third stated flatly that "censorship does little good." While beyond the scope of this paper, it would be interesting and useful to investigate the relationship between the prison administration and the librarian to determine whether any causal relationship exists between the way librarians' relate to officials above them on the prison hierarchy and their views on matters such as the censorship of materials.

Censorship in prisons is a fact accepted as necessary by many if not most authorities. The impact of this policy of deliberately restricting inmate access to certain materials on the work of the prison library and the prison librarian

varies from institution to institution. Further study in this area would be useful to determine what, if any, effects the policy has on the use of the library by inmates.

Use of Inmate Staff in the Library

The use of inmate staff to serve as support staff in the prison library is a long established fact. Virtually all prison libraries in the state of Ohio utilize inmate staff in the daily operation of the library. Yet, there is little in the literature about the use of such staff, and there appears to have been little research done on their use in libraries. This chapter investigates the selection and deployment of inmates, their job training, and the methods by which they are evaluated.

Selection and deployment of inmate staff. The questions of how inmates are selected to work in the library, how many inmates are assigned to work there, and how they are deployed, i.e., what jobs they do and how long each works each day or week -- these are the focus of this chapter. Librarians were asked questions dealing with the number of inmates working in the library, the tasks they perform, the number of hours weekly that they work (on average), their selection (criteria used, role of the librarian in their selection), and the parameters of their work, i.e., things they are expected to do or are prohibited from doing while on the job.

The number of inmates assigned to the three libraries varies by a factor of ten. One library has forty inmates listed on its work roster, another four. The third library is close to the mean with seventeen. The number of inmate staff for the library is determined by the prison administration, and all three librarians indicated that they have little influence on the numbers. Two of them, however, did indicate that it would not be difficult for them to alter that number slightly if the need presented itself. The third librarian (also the one with the greatest number of inmate staff) stated flatly that such a change would be difficult if not impossible. The librarian with the smallest number of inmate staff is happiest with the staffing situation. Whereas the individual with a staff of four indicated complete satisfaction with that number, the librarian with forty inmate workers in the library expressed considerable disatisfaction with the situation. The latter indicated that there is little control over the work of the inmate staff in the library, and that the number of staff is too great to allow adequate training, supervision, or job evaluation. Also, retaining staff in this situation becomes difficult, and this individual indicated that it is often easier for inmates to quit their jobs than it is for the librarian to have them removed for poor work performance. As might be expected, the librarian with the fewest workers feels the most control over them while the librarian with the most workers feels the least control. Some concern was expressed

by the librarians with the largest numbers of inmate staff that inmates with neither interest nor ability might be "dumped" on their library for administrative or security reasons, and that they would have little control over their (the inmates') work. On the other hand, the librarian with only four inmate employees did not express this concern and the prospect does not seem to be of concern.

The actual work the inmates do in the library varies from library to library, and is the responsibility of the librarian to determine. Basically, the work is of the type that clerical workers are expected to do in a public library, that is, circulation control, typing, filing, and reshelving materials; however, there are other duties that can be classed as para-professional duties. For example, in all three libraries there are inmate staff who serve as legal reference clerks, assisting other inmates with the use of legal materials in the preparation of their legal papers. In some cases these individuals serve virtually as para-legals, while in other situations they more closely resemble reference law librarians. In either case, though, they serve in a para-professional role, and librarians are constantly looking for individuals with some legal background to fill these positions. One library has a position called "Patron Service Clerk," and the job description for this position states "provide basic assistance to patrons in locating library materials and information located in the card catalog." This sounds very similar to at least part of the

role many reference librarians fill, and this position could also be seen as more of a para-professional position than a clerical one.

One of the libraries visited includes a number of unit libraries housed in the various unit cell blocks. These are essentially paperback collections for the use of the inmates in that unit, and are staffed by an inmate. The "Library Aides Handbook" for that prison states that "The Unit Library Aide may organize the unit library as they (sic) like as long as the appearance of the library is clean & neat." Again, this is a fairly responsible position. It is this library that employs seventeen inmate staff members. One of the reasons for the larger number of inmate staff in this prison library is because of the need to staff the unit libraries. On the other hand, the librarian with forty inmate staff workers stated that there is difficulty giving each person a responsibility and in keeping that many persons busy in the library.

The length of time each inmate staff member spends working in the library is indirectly related to the number of inmates assigned to work in that library. In the library with the largest number of inmate staff the average number of hours per week that inmates work is significantly less than it is in the library with only four inmate staff. Those inmates assigned to work in the library with four inmate staff members can expect to spend about thirty hours per week working there. Those in the library with seventeen inmate

staff average about twenty hours per week, while the forty inmates working in the third library each average only about ten or twelve hours per week.

Generally speaking, the corrections officials select the workers for the library (as well as for other areas in the prison), and the librarian has only minimal input. Unfortunately, in this study the library with the largest number of workers is also the one in which the librarian appears to have the least input into selecting staff. In the other two institutions the librarians have greater say in who is selected to work in their libraries. One of these two (the librarian with seventeen inmate staff members) stated that "basically I interview interested people and make the choice, I do most of the choosing." Still, the final decision is not the librarian's, but generally that of either the Unit Manager (the Corrections Officer in charge of the cell unit) or one of the deputy wardens. Significantly, both of these librarians indicated that if there was an inmate who they did not want in their library they would have no difficulty in keeping him/her from being employed. The third librarian, however, not only had to deal with what is perceived as a surfeit of inmate staff, but this person also feels less confident about the ability to keep an undesirable inmate off the rolls. It is interesting to note that the librarian with the least input into selecting staff is also the one who knows least about the criteria used to make that selection. That librarian indicated little knowledge of the criteria

used to select staff, while the other two were able to point to things such as education level (high school diploma or G.E.D. equivalent), past experience, intellectual ability to understand the Dewey Decimal System, and legal experience. In some cases it is important to employ an individual with time left on his/her term in order to recoup the amount of time spent in training.

There is wide variation from institution to institution in virtually all aspects of the use of inmate staff in the three prisons studied. This variation exists particularly with regard to the number of inmates employed. This, in turn, affects the amount of control the librarian is able to exercise over staff, their continuity of service, and the ability to provide them with meaningful and responsible work. These librarians also disagree on the amount of influence they wield on who is chosen to work in the library, with one indicating little or no influence, and the other two indicating that they have a reasonable amount of influence over the selection of staff.

Training of inmate staff. It is probably a safe generalization to say that the average inmate in one of the state's correctional facilities would have spent but little time as a patron in either a school or public library. Similarly, it is doubtful that more than a very small fraction of a percentage of the state's prison population would have ever worked in a library. Given these generalizations, it would seem reasonable to assume that the

matter of training of the inmate staff to work in the library is an important aspect of the prison librarian's role. Therefore, the librarians interviewed were questioned about the training of inmate staff, including the librarian's philosophy of training and the training program itself.

It came as a surprise to discover what little emphasis the librarians interviewed place on the training of inmates to carry out their duties in the library. Only one of them has a written training program for the jobs held by inmates. This is in the form of a brief handbook for the library staff. This person feels that most operations in the library are pretty simple; he/she goes through the procedures with staff and as they have problems they ask. Another has a set of instructions written for each procedure done in the library. These are posted in the relevant areas so that staff have access to them when performing the procedure (e.g., checking out a book). The method of training was described by this librarian as being a "walk through" of the jobs expected of inmates until they learn the procedures. This is then continued until it comes naturally. The third librarian does essentially the same -- the training is done verbally.

Two of the librarians expressed the view that it is beneficial to have inmates train other inmates for the jobs in the library. One of the three stated that "it is easier and important for the inmate staff to show each other how to do the jobs." A second lets inmates with some legal experience train other inmates to work with the legal

collection. This librarian also trains some inmates to do simple cataloging and then has those inmates pass along these skills to others.

There appears to be a view amongst all three librarians that training of inmates for their positions in the library is not as important as others might think it should be. One, for example, holds the view that no matter how much job training is given inmates most of them lack the educational background to be trained to do much more than what is basic to keep the library running effectively. While this is probably all that most librarians are striving for, the comment does indicate a certain antipathy to spending a great deal of time and resources in the training process. Another of the three stated that because of the large turnover in staff in many prison libraries, training could become a disruptive element in the day to day running of the library if taken too seriously. The third stated flatly that training of inmates for their jobs "is not emphasized."

All inmate employees of their prison library must be trained to do their jobs. Unless training of some sort occurs inmates will have little understanding of how to do the work that is expected of them, and the library will not be functional. The librarians interviewed did indicate that they do train their staff in some way -- one, verbally and informally, a second by having instruction sheets strategically placed in the library, and the third by using a staff handbook as a training manual. Two of the three also

indicated that it is important for inmates to carry out some of the training of other inmates, and that in some cases the librarian is not directly involved in the training at all. Overall, the attitudes of the librarians indicate that they do not hold the training of inmate staff as a top priority in the day to day operation of their libraries.

Evaluation of inmate staff. This section deals with the work evaluation of inmate staff in the three prisons being studied. The librarians interviewed were questioned on whether inmates are formally evaluated, how often this occurs, whether a written policy on evaluation exists, the criteria on which inmates are assessed, and what the outcomes of the evaluation process are.

Inmates are formally assessed in their work performance in these libraries at least once after they begin work. All three librarians stated that policy in their institution is for all inmate employees to be given a probationary work evaluation after one month on the job, and that an annual work evaluation is to be given on the anniversary of their beginning work in the library. It appears, though, that this is not always done. One librarian stated that the annual assessment "probably does not happen that often," and that special evaluations are more common. Special evaluations are work evaluations carried out for specific purposes. These specific purposes might be because an inmate is to appear before the parole board, or, on the

other side of the coin, because a librarian wishes to get rid of an employee and have his/her job classification changed.

It is obvious that a Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections policy on the work evaluation of inmate staff does exist. The interviewees themselves stated that this was the case. Furthermore, each of the librarians interviewed follow similar procedures when assessing inmates. The "Inmate Evaluation Report," the form that all three librarians use to evaluate staff workers, is a standard form with the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections heading on it. This form is the main mechanism used for evaluating inmate performance on the job. Unfortunately, this writer was not able to locate the written departmental guidelines or policy statement on inmate work evaluation.

Inmate staff are evaluated on their performance in seven areas. These criteria include attitude, initiative, quality/quantity, attendance, dependability, safety/housekeeping, and increasing knowledge/skills. The back of the form defines and explains each of the criteria. Each item is rated on a scale of one to ten, with one indicating "poor performance," and ten indicating "excellent performance." The scores are then totalled to give a "Total Evaluation Rating."

The evaluations are carried out by the librarian, and signed both by the librarian and the inmate. The inmate's signature indicates that he/she has read the report, but does not necessarily indicate his/her agreement with it. There is some disagreement among the librarians interviewed as to who

gets the evaluation report after it is done. One stated that a deputy warden reviews it, a second stated that the Job Coordinator receives it next, while the third stated that it goes to the inmate's case manager for review. The evaluations are primarily used to assist the prison authorities in making decisions about placement of inmates, for example, for inmates who are to appear before the parole board, or for inmates who are being considered for job reclassification (either classified up or down). Thus, if an inmate consistently receives a superior rating in his/her evaluations, this will help that person when he/she appears before the parole board. On the other hand, if a librarian wishes to have an inmate removed from the job this will be made easier if the librarian can point to consistently poor job evaluations.

According to one librarian, the procedures for assessing the work performance of inmate staff are often not followed precisely. This librarian feels that the influence of the prison administration is heavily felt in the evaluations, and that on occasions those doing the evaluations have been told not to rate inmates too highly even if workers deserve it. On the other hand, this same librarian stated that too often if the inmate objects to a poor rating the prison authorities uphold that objection, even if the rating is deserved. It is only fair to point out, however, that neither of the other two librarians interviewed expressed this concern.

While prison libraries are staffed by inmate employees, there are many inconsistencies in the system from library to library. The number of staff assigned to a library, the way the inmates assigned to a library are selected, the amount of input into the selection process that the prison librarian has, the job tasks performed by the inmate staff, the number of hours per week each inmate has on the job all vary from one library to the other. Training of inmate staff appears to take a lower priority among the librarians interviewed than was expected, with all three librarians indicating that staff training is carried out in an informal and low-key manner. The job evaluation of inmates, however, is seen as more important due to the impact of those evaluations on inmates' parole hearings and job reclassification.

Library Services to Prisoners

Directives from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections clearly define the policy with regard to inmate access to library services and to library programs for inmates. Departmental directive No. 106/01 states that

> the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction shall provide services in a helpful and friendly atmosphere, assuring reasonable access to comprehensive library services.[20]

Further, directive No. 106/11 states that

> special planned events which introduce users to the broad range of library services or activities, or which provide information through the presentation of talks, films, etc. (sic) The librarian shall include in the library long and short range plans appropriate library programming to meet user and non-user needs.[21]

These directives make it clear that inmates are to have access to the library and that provision of library programs is an important part of the librarian's role in these institutions. This chapter attempts to investigate these matters as they apply to the three prison libraries being studied.

Inmate access to the library. This section looks at the physical access to the library that inmates have. Questions were asked that dealt with the hours that the library is open, the number of hours that inmates can use the library if they choose to do so, the percentage of the total prison population that actually uses the library, the number of books and other materials that inmates can check out, the means that the librarian has of controlling inmates in the library, and the provisions made for delivery of library services to inmates who are not able to go to the library.

The number of hours that each library is open to inmates varies from institution to institution. To some extent the hours are dependent upon the type of institution, and, therefore, the types of prisoners to be catered to. For example, one of the institutions in the study is a short-term facility at which inmates spend only a very brief period of time before being sent to other longer-term prisons. Facilities such as this one generally have two different types of inmates -- the short term inmates (known as "reception") and longer term inmates who carry out many of the jobs around the institution (known as "cadre"). The two

different classes of inmate are not permitted to mix, and therefore the library hours must cater to two different groups of patrons using the library at different times. In addition, certain prison formalities require that the library be closed at certain times during the day -- especially when a head count of inmates is taken, a procedure that is taken several times each day, and during which all inmates must be at their assigned place in order to be included in the count. Obviously, there are no patrons available for the library during these times, and therefore there is little purpose in having the library open.

Staffing is another factor that influences the amount of time the library is open for inmate use. Two of the prison libraries are staffed by one person only (aside from inmate staff). This obviously cuts down on the time the library can be open, although in both cases the librarians have organized alternative methods of maintaining access to library materials for inmates. The other facility is staffed by a professional librarian and a para-professional library assistant.

Access to the library materials varies from 34.25 hours per week in one library, to 47 hours per week for a second, to 59.5 hours per week for the third. The two libraries offering the greatest number of hours of service for inmate use are both one-person libraries, and they have been forced to make alternative arrangements for keeping their facilities open during the absence of the librarian.

One of these has a number of small unit libraries in each cell unit, and these are staffed by inmate staff. These are very small paperback book collections -- essentially "branches" of the main library. The main library is open for 24.5 hours per week, while the branch libraries are open for 35 hours per week. These hours do coincide, but because of this arrangement inmates are offered additional access to the library. This appears to be a suitable adjustment to the problem of lack of professional staff time, and the librarian appears to be quite satisfied with this arrangement. The other one-person library uses corrections staff to watch the library in the librarian's absence. This library is open for 47 hours per week, but only 27.25 hours per week is with the librarian there. During the other 19.75 hours that the library is open it is under the supervision of a corrections officer. This is, according to the librarian, a far less satisfactory arrangement. According to the librarian the corrections officers are less likely to keep careful track of library materials, and the librarian believes that library resources are lost under the supervision of these officers. Unfortunately, with the lack of additional staff in the library the alternatives are to keep the library open under this arrangement or to have it open for fewer hours each week. Both the librarian and the prison administration believe that the second alternative is not as acceptable as the first one.

The question of how much access to the library individual inmates have involves more than just the number of hours per week the library is open. Several external factors influence the amount of inmate access. One of these factors is the reason that the inmate wants to use the library. In all three libraries those inmates wanting to use the law library to prepare their legal cases have greater access to the library than do those inmates wanting to use the regular library. In all three libraries those inmates wishing to work on their legal cases are limited only by the time that the library is open.

For security reasons inmates wishing to use the library must first obtain permission from the corrections officer in their unit. Normally this is not difficult to obtain. However, in one of the prisons the number of inmates permitted into the library at any one time is also limited, and inmates are allowed entry on a first-come-first-served basis. It is probable that an inmate in any of the prisons could be barred from using the library for any of a number of reasons. For example, if a C.O. feels that an inmate is abusing the privilege that inmate might not be allowed to use the library on a certain day. Inmates who are in trouble for some indiscretion could likewise expect to find their access to the library limited. The point is that there are any number of reasons that an inmate might find the library inaccessible on any given day.

Those inmates who do manage to stay out of trouble and who obtain permission to go to the library when it is open find that the amount of time that they can avail themselves of the library varies from library to library. For example, in the library described above, with two different classes of inmate, "cadre" can use the library for up to eighteen hours per week, while "reception" inmates are limited to only one and a half hours per week (this does not include access to the law library). In this library "cadre" have access to the law library for up to thirty hours per week, while "reception" inmates have access to the legal resources for up to twelve hours per week. Inmates in the other two facilities have fewer restrictions on their use of the library. In one of them an inmate intent on using the library to the fullest and who does not experience any restrictions can use the regular library for up to three hours daily for seven days a week, and the law library for up to six and a half hours on weekdays and seven and a quarter hours on Saturday and Sunday. The third facility is the one with unit libraries. It is accessible to inmates any time it is open (this includes both the main library and the unit libraries), a total of 35 hours per week (unit libraries are open for 35 hours per week, but 24.5 of these coincide with the hours of the main library).

None of the three librarians have kept accurate statistics on the number of inmates using their libraries. All three, however, were able to estimate the percentage of

the total prison population that visits the library daily or over the course of a week. In one library the librarian estimates that about 250 inmates visit the library daily -- about 11% of the prison's 2200 inmates. In a second the librarian estimates that about 25% of the "cadre" and 20% of the "reception" inmates visit the library at least once a week. This is out of a total prison population of 2000 "reception" prisoners and 250 "cadre." The third librarian estimated that up to 50% of the prison's 500 inmates use the library each week. This figure includes numbers for the unit library facilities as well as those for the main library. It should be noted that these figures are estimates only, based upon the librarian's perception of the numbers visiting the library, and are presented not as accurate figures, but only as guides. By any measure these figures represent a reasonable amount of usage of library facilities by inmates.

Each library sets its own limits on the number of books that inmates can check out. One permits only one book at a time to be checked out, with no further charges permitted until the first book has been returned. In a second, inmates are permitted to check out two books per week, with only three permitted against his/her name at any time. In the third library "cadre" are allowed to check out up to four books for two weeks, and "reception" inmates two books for one week. All three librarians discussed the problem of books leaving the library without being checked out. Periodically a cell-search is conducted enlisting the

aid of corrections officers to search cells for missing books.

The matter of security and control is an important aspect of prison librarianship. While only tangentially concerned with inmate access to the library, it is an aspect of the use of the library by the prison population with which the librarian must cope. The possibility of loss of materials due to theft (unregistered borrowing?) by inmates is a significant problem according to both the librarians interviewed and the literature on the subject. All three librarians mentioned the need to search for missing items. One of them pointed out that control over the collection is only as good as the inmate at the circulation desk, and that this person has a large element of control over materials that go out of the library. Elaborate security systems are probably unaffordable to most prison libraries, and, therefore, security of the resources becomes dependent upon the staff. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the librarian to select, if possible, circulation clerks who are dependable and without obligation to other inmates. Of course, close supervision of the staff is also necessary.

Aside from securing the collection, control of inmate users is another area that prison librarians must look after. All three librarians indicated that although a corrections officer is seldom in the library (at least while the librarian is there -- in one library corrections officers look after the users in the absence of the librarian), an

officer is always nearby, and this is an effective deterrent to problems with prisoners in the library. All three librarians indicated that they have other means of controlling the inmates at their disposal, and that these are fairly effective, since problems with inmates do not appear to be a major cause of concern. Each of them can, and does, "write-up" (write conduct reports on) inmates who create a disturbance in the library. One of the three, who experiences few problems from inmates attributes this to having established and publicized clear cut rules for use of the library, to having the ability (and willingness) to have inmates removed from and kept out of the library. One librarian further stated that inmates are never left unattended in the library. It is interesting to note that of the three librarians interviewed two do not, as a rule, wear a "man-down" security device, and that both of these are women. This device is worn at the belt and transmits an alarm signal to the security offices if it is set off by a button, or if it is laid on its side. Overall, while security of materials is a problem at each of these libraries, control of inmates is not seen as a major problem, and all three seem to feel confident about their ability to control their patrons.

There are some inmates who lack direct access to the library because they have been placed into one of the forms of custody that each prison has. Each of the librarians interviewed indicated that such inmates are supplied with library materials if these are requested. In two of the

prisons a supply of reading materials is kept at the "hole" under the control of the unit manager or the corrections officers. In the third prison the librarian delivers materials to inmates upon request. In each of the prisons requested books, especially legal materials, are also loaned to these prisoners upon request. In one of the institutions a supply of legal materials is included with the other materials kept for these inmates.

Inmates at these three institutions have access to the library for several hours per day if they so wish, and those wishing to use the law library have even greater access to the library. Each library allows the inmate-user to check out one or more books at a time for up to one week per book. In return, according to the librarians in charge of those libraries, the inmates have responded well. The librarians in charge of these libraries estimate that between 20% and 50% of the total inmate population visits the library at least once a week. While these figures are only estimates, they do indicate that these libraries serve a significant number of the total inmate population.

Library sponsored programs for inmates. This section attempts to ascertain whether or not the libraries being studied offer any sort of library-based programming for inmates. The librarians were questioned to ascertain whether or not the library offers any educational, recreational, or pre-release-type programs, and if these sorts of programs are offered to inmates how successful they are. Other questions

dealt with the reasons programs are not offered (if the librarian indicated that they are not offered), and the support for such programming that comes from the prison hierarchy. Finally, the librarians were asked about programs that they would like to organize if they had the resources and the support to do so.

Two of the three librarians interviewed stated that library-sponsored programs for inmates have been offered at their library, while the other stated that such programs have not been offered by the library for a number of reasons. This third librarian feels that since other prison departments offer programs for inmates, there is a danger that library-sponsored programs might impinge upon those programs. In addition, this librarian indicated that little time for programs is available, since this person is the only library officer serving an inmate population of over 2200 inmates. Estimates are that up to 250 inmates per day use this library. While the librarian might offer programs on certain subjects if the opportunity arose, there are additional difficulties that have to be overcome, including the lack of space and funding. This librarian does feel, though, that if such programs were planned and organized, they would meet with the approval and support of the prison administration.

The other two librarians interviewed both indicated that they have offered library-sponsored programs in their facilities. One used the library to sponsor a literacy program organized and run by an organization called Community

Connection. Community Connection is a non-profit agency, based in Columbus, Ohio, which serves to assist adult offenders to make the transition from prison to the outside. This program was intended to train inmates to teach illiterate or semi-literate inmates reading skills. Participants were volunteers and the program was run on Saturday morning. Unfortunately this program ended when the representative from Community Connection, who ran the program, stopped visiting the institution. According to officials from Community Connection, the decision to stop the visits was made because the resources necessary to continue the program were not available. The librarian at this institution described this program as being the least successful of those attempted because of this.

This same librarian is considering several other programs for inmates. These include a braille transcription program which would create braille manuscripts of stories to be distributed in the community. Another program being investigated is a book discussion group which would discuss books from a number of different genres. A third is a legal research seminar in which inmates would learn how to do legal research from a person skilled and knowledgeable in this area. At this point in time these programs are being planned, and knowledgeable people to teach them are being sought. The librarian did say that a person skilled in the area of legal research to run the legal research seminar has been difficult to locate.

In the third prison library the librarian has recently concluded a program in which twelve interested inmates met on Saturday mornings for five weeks to discuss issues related to the topic of freedom of speech. This program was inititated by the librarian and sponsored and funded by the Kettering Foundation. The forum was available to the first twelve persons who signed up for it and, according to the librarian, was very successful. This was the first such program offered by this librarian, and because of its success, additional programs in the form of booktalk sessions are being planned. The librarian stated that of the original twelve persons who began the program ten finished it. The other two did not complete the program because they left the prison before the program was finished.

This same librarian also became involved in a combined program with the prison chaplain. In this program inmates acted out Leonardo's "Last Supper" as part of an Easter season religious service. According to the librarian, this, too, turned out to be a successful enterprise in terms of inmate participation. As a result of the success of these programs this librarian has applied for and received a LSCA grant through the State Library of Ohio. With this grant the librarian is in the process of organizing programs on the topics of American environmental history, poetry, ethnic identity, and political philosophies.

All three librarians had similar reasons for not running more library-sponsored programs for inmates. The lack

of time to organize and run such programs, the lack of physical space in which to hold them, and difficulty in finding the right people to present the programs to the inmates are the main reasons given. All three librarians mentioned at least two of these three factors in their analysis of why more programs are not run in their libraries. Interestingly enough, only one librarian mentioned funding as a major reason for not holding more such activities. The impact of prison administrative staff on library programming was varied, according to the librarians. The responses varied from "I have definitely been supported by the warden and the prison administration -- this warden is programs oriented," to "Programming has been done in spite of the hierarchy. The administration has not prevented, but neither has it helped in programming." Like so many other things in the prison context, it appears that the impact of the prison administration varies from institution to institution.

Each librarian had strong opinions on the importance of programming for inmates. One, the librarian who did not program in the library, stated that the programs often do not work because the inmates lack motivation and drop out of the program before they end. This librarian felt that programs must be well planned and organized, they must be inter-disciplinary in approach, and aimed at the rehabilitation of prisoners. A second pointed out that the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction guidelines on showing of videos to inmates is detrimental to the provision

of programs in the library. These guidelines evidently require Departmental approval before videos can be purchased, and limit the types of videos purchased to "educational" videos only, prohibiting the purchase of recreational videos. The third pointed out that his/her institution is a new one and that as the library is in a building process it takes time to develop and build programs in such an institution.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

As this paper is a descriptive case study it is difficult to draw definite conclusions about prison libraries in general from the information gained in the study. A view of the way three different librarians in three different correctional facilities deal with specific issues is not representative enough to offer broad based generalizations. The study does, however, offer insight into the ways librarians handle specific matters, and it does expose areas in which additional research might prove valuable.

The study indicates that effective relationships between the prison administration and the librarian are important to the success of the library program. It appears that in virtually every area studied the impact of the prison administration is significant. The informal funding arrangements, for example, indicate that prison administrators exercise significant control over funding for these libraries. Similarly, in the ordering and delivery of library materials the heavy hand of the bureaucracy can be seen in the concern that the librarians expressed over delays in the delivery of ordered materials. The matter of censorship is another area in which the prison administration has an obvious impact upon the work of the librarian. The

same is true regarding the use of inmate staff in the library. Clearly, the prison administrators have considerable influence over the librarian's use of inmate staff. All three librarians are very dependent upon the prison administration with regard to the number and quality of the inmates who work in their libraries. There is some indication that this influence is felt even in the evaluation of that staff. At least one of those interviewed indicated that the influence of the administration is heavily felt in those evaluations. The influence of the prison administration can be seen in the amount of access to the library facilities inmates have. Corrections Officers control the prisoners' movements to such an extent that an inmate can easily be barred from using the library at all. Similarly, it is easy to see that prison officials exert great influence over the security and control of the library, sometimes to the satisfaction of the librarian, and sometimes to the librarian's chagrin.

Because of the influence of the corrections staff, both administrative and support staff, on the day to day working of the library, this is an area that warrants further investigation. It would be interesting to determine the views of wardens and deputy wardens on library programs and services in their prisons, and to tie these views to the effectiveness of those programs and to the job satisfaction of the librarian.

Other areas of study can be selected from the findings of this one. For example, the funding of prison libraries is

an area that is ripe for study. It is easy to assume that the library in a prison environment might suffer from a lack of adequate funding. Yet, according to the three librarians interviewed in this paper, this is not the case. Each of these expressed the view that their library did not suffer from a lack of funds. It would be useful to ascertain if all Ohio libraries are this well funded. What is the impact of the use of inmate-generated money on the funding of prison libraries? What influence does the prison administration have on library funding, and is this beneficial or detrimental to the library program? These and other questions dealing with the funding of prison libraries warrant study.

Studies of the use of inmate staff in the library could also yield very beneficial returns. It would be advantageous to know whether patterns exist in the ways inmate staff are selected and deployed, and which of the methods used yield the most efficient results for the library. The training of inmate staff does not rate a high priority among the librarians interviewed. Is this a view held by most prison librarians? What are the best methods for training inmates to serve in the library?

This study indicates that a wide variety of things influence an inmate's use of the library. It also indicates that a sizeable proportion of the prison population uses the library during the week, though these figures are not based upon reliable statistical records. More in depth research would yield some very useful information on the inmates who

do use the library, e.g., who they are (that is, what are the characteristics of prison library users?), the purposes for which inmates use the library, and how often they use it. Careful investigation could also cast light on reasons that some inmates do not use the library. For example, some inmates may not use the library because of external pressures (from prison guards or work conflicts or pressure from other inmates). Others may stay away because they are illiterate, or they neither know that it exists, nor what it can offer them. While this study showed that two of the librarians have conducted library-based programs for inmates, it has also shown that, at least for some librarians, provision of library based programs for inmates is not a top priority. Again, this study does not allow us to generalize about library programming in prisons, but it would not be difficult to gain additional insight into this facet of prison life by conducting additional research into the matter. For the librarian these are more than just matters of interest, and if research could be conducted that would shed additional light on them it could prove beneficial not only to the prison librarian in his work, but to the inmates and prison staff as well.

It is clear from this study that many things influence the way prison librarians deal with the issues that face them in their work. The impact of the prison administration and staff, the physical space available in the libraries, the number of para-professional staff available to assist the

librarian, the type and number of prisoners in the institution, even the personality and interests of the librarian, as well as many additional factors all mix to result in an environment that is unique in the world of libraries.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE -- PRISON LIBRARIANS

I. MATERIALS SELECTION AND ACQUISITION (INCLUDING CENSORSHIP)

Role, goals, mission

1. Briefly describe what you consider your role or mission to be as prison librarian.
2. What function does your library serve in the prison context?

Budget and time-frame

a.1 Does your library have a budget which can be used for the purchase of books and materials?
a.2 If so, how much money has been allocated to the library in each of the past three years?
a.3 From what source does the money you have to spend on the library come?
a.4 In your opinion is the amount of money allocated to the library adequate to meet the library's needs?
a.5 Can you purchase materials whenever you wish? If not, how often do you purchase resources for your library?
a.6 Are there any restrictions on the number of times you can order or purchase items for your library?
a.7 If there are restrictions, who makes those restrictions, and why are they made?
a.8 Are there restrictions on who you can order library materials from?
a.9 If there are such restrictions, who makes those restrictions, and why are they made?
a.10 Do you have any other comments about the issue of the library budget and the ordering of library materials?

Determining needs and interests

b.1 How do you select the resources you purchase for the library?
b.2 What sources do you use to select those resources?
b.3 What needs of the inmate patrons of your library do you attempt to meet when selecting materials to purchase?
b.4 How do you determine what those (patron) needs are?
b.5 Do you ever carry out user surveys to determine patron wants and needs?
b.6 Do you ever consult with prison staff when selecting resources to purchase for the library? If so, which officers (list offices, not names -- e.g., teaching staff, TIE Deputy Programs, etc.).

b.7 Do you ever consult any other individuals either inside or outside the prison environment when selecting materials to purchase?
b.8 Do you have any other comments about the issue of determining the needs and interests of prison library patrons?

Censorship of materials

c.1 Do you know the prison guidelines on the sorts of reading materials that are unacceptable in a prison situation?
c.2 When ordering materials for the library do you follow those guidelines?
c.3 Do you follow any other guidelines regarding the acceptibility of materials in the prison context?
c.4 have any materials that you have ordered been cancelled by someone in the prison hierarchy because it was felt that those materials were not suitable for prison inmates to read?
c.5 who in the prison hierarchy has made the decision to cancel those items?
c.6 Were you consulted either before or after the decision was made to cancel items from the library order?
c.7 Does the policy of censoring what inmates read impact upon your work in the prison library?
c.8 If that policy does impact you and your work describe that impact.
c.9 Do you think that policy affects inmate use of the library, and if so, how?
c.10 Do you have any other comments about the issue of censorship in the prison library?

II. USE OF INMATE STAFF

Selection of inmate staff

d.1 How many inmates work in your library?
d.2 List and describe the jobs they do in the library.
d.3 How many hours per week (on average) does each work in the library?
d.4 Who selects the inmate staff?
d.5 What criteria are used to select the staffmembers?
d.6 What role do you play in the selection of inmate staff?
d.7 List some things that inmate staff are not permitted to do while working in the prison library (either for security reasons or for 'professional' reasons. How do these proscriptions affect their work
d.8 Do you have additional comments about the selection of inmate staff for the library?

Training of inmate staff

e.1 Briefly describe your philosophy on training of inmate library staff.
e.2 Is a written program for training inmate staff available, or can you verbally describe that training program?
e.3 Do you have additional comments about the selection of inmate staff for the library?

Evaluation of inmate staff

f.1 do you ever formally evaluate the work performance of the inmate staff of your library?

f.2 If so, how often is such an assessment carried out?

f.3 Do you have a written assessment policy for the assessment of inmate staff in your library? Is it possible for me to see that policy?

f.4 Do you use an assessment sheet? If so, could I have a copy?

f.5 What are the criteria on which you assess your inmate staff?

f.6 What is done with the assessment report done on inmate staff (e.g., does it go to a higher authority?) Who receives it, and what is finally done with that report?

f.7 If an inmate consistently receives a poor assessment what happens?

f.8 If an inmate consistently receives an excellent assessment what happens?

f.9 Do you have additional comments about the evaluation of inmate staff?

III. LIBRARY SERVICES TO PRISONERS

Inmate access to the library

g.1 What hours is your library open for inmate use?

g.2 On the average, how many hours per week could each inmate use the library if (s)he chose to?

g.3 What percentage of the total prison population uses the library each week?

g.4 How many books at a time is each inmate allowed to check out?

g.5 What means do you have for controlling inmate patrons in the library?

g.6 Your prison probably has inmates who are not able, for security or other reasons, to come to the library. How does your library cater for their needs?

g.7 Do you have any additional comments about inmate access to the library?

Library sponsored programs for inmates

h.1 Have you offered any sorts of library sponsored educational, recreational, or pre-release information-type programs for inmate patrons (e.g., booktalks, bibliotherapy programs, storytelling sessions, slide or video presentations, 'how-to' programs, etc.)? Discuss and describe these.

h.1a If you have not offered such programs discuss the reasons for this.

h.1b Would you like the opportunity to offer such programs, and if you would what are you doing to make it possible to offer them in the future.

EVEN IF YOU HAVE NOT OFFERED SUCH PROGRAMS IN YOUR LIBRARY IN THE PAST, PLEASE ANSWER AS MANY OF THE FOLLOWING AS ARE APPLICABLE.

h.2 Describe the success of these programs -- if it is possible to quantify your answer please do so -- e.g., state the number of inmates participating, the results of any post-program evaluations done by participants, etc.

h.3 Describe the sorts of programs offered through the library that have been the most successful -- to what do you attribute their success?

h.4 Describe the sorts of programs offered through the library that have been the least successful -- to what do you attribute this lack of success?

h.5 Describe the way that those above you in the prison administrative hierarchy have supported the library programming for inmates that you have attempted.

h.6 Describe any other types of programs that you would like to offer to inmates but that you have not been able to offer?

h.7 Why have you been unable to offer these programs?

h.8 What would you need to make your library programs for inmates more successful?

h.9 Do you have additional comments about library programming for prisoners offered in prison libraries?

REFERENCES

1. Fred Hartz, Michael B. Krimmel, and Emilie K. Hartz, Prison Librarianship: A Selective, Annotated, Classified Bibliography, 1945-85 (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1987).

2. Barbara Haymann-Diaz, "Establishing a Selection Process Model for an Ethnic Collection in a Prison Library," Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian 8 nos. 1/2 (1989): 33-49.

3. Jay Ihrig, "La Biblioteca: Myth or Reality for the Hispanic Inmate," Hispanic Books Bulletin 1 no. 4 (1988): 11-13.

4. Darby Penney, "Collection Development in Prison Libraries," CLIC Quarterly 3 (June 1984): 36-45.

5. Susan MacDonald, ed., "Acquisitions for Prison Libraries: A Selected Bibliography, by David Allan Coe, and a Response, by Christine L. Kirby," Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory 7 no. 1 (1983): 29-33.

6. Michael Sawyer, "I Know What's Best for You: Censorship in Prison," Ohio Libraries 4 no. 2 (1991): 8-11.

7. Sheldon Krantz, The Law of Corrections and Prisoners' Rights in a Nutshell, 2d ed. (St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co., 1983).

8. Stanton Samenow, Inside the Criminal Mind (New York: Times Books, 1984).

9. Malin Akerstrom, Crooks and Squares: Lifestyles of Thieves and Addicts in Comparison to Conventional People (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1985).

10. Stephen Mallinger, "Games Inmates Play," Corrections Today 53 (December 1991): 188-192.

11. Cornelia Holbert, "Feet Off the Circulation Desk," The Bookmark 38 (Winter 1979): 95-98.

12. American Correctional Association, Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, 2d ed. (College Park, MD: American Correctional Assoc., 1981).

13. Joanne Lefebvre, "Lone Librarian Behind Bars: Courses Offer Hope to Inmates," Canadian Library Journal 45 (April 1988): 84-89.

14. Joanne Locke, and Anne Galler, "Innovative Prison Project: Breaking Out With Books," Canadian Library Journal 45 (April 1988): 77-81.

15. Coyle, William, Libraries in Prisons: A Blending of Institutions New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

16. Donald A. Drewett, "Prison Programs and Library Services," The Bookmark 44 (Winter 1986): 112-113.

17. Jane Pool, "Library Services to Correctional Facilities," Catholic Library World 56 (April 1985): 387-389.

18. Myra Albert, "Redirecting Library Services for State Correctional Prisons," The Bookmark 44 (Winter 1986): 81-88.

19. Linda Bayley, Leni Greenfield, and Flynn Nogueira, Jail Library Service: A Guide for Librarians and Jail Administrators (Chicago: American Library Association, 1981).

20. Alan J. Lazaroff, "New Policy Directives (No. 106/01)," to Deputy Directors, Wardens, Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Intra-Departmental Reference, Columbus, Ohio, October 23, 1991.

21. Alan J. Lazaroff, "New Policy Directives (No. 106/11)," to Deputy Directors, Wardens, Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Intra-Departmental Reference, Columbus, Ohio, October, 23, 1991.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akerstrom, Malin. Crooks and Squares: Lifestyles of Thieves and Addicts in Comparison to Conventional People. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1985.

Albert, Myra. "Prison Libraries: Rationale and Role," Journal of Correctional Education. 40 (1989): 126-129.

_____. "Redirecting Library Services for State Correctional Prisons."The Bookmark. 44 (Winter 1986): 81-88.

Amberchele, J.C. "One Hour Once A Week." Colorado Libraries. 14 (June 1988): 12.

American Correctional Association. Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions. 2d ed. College Park, MD: American Correctional Assoc., 1981.

Bayley, Linda, Greenfield, Leni, and Nogueira, Flynn. Jail Library Service: A Guide for Librarians and Jail Administrators. Chicago: American Library Association, 1981.

Bradley, Plummer. "Library Services Behind the Wall for Prisoners." The Bookmark. 43 (Fall 1984): 38-40.

Carns, Brenda. "Locked Up Libraries." Colorado Libraries. 15 (Sept. 1989): 17-18.

Childress, Michael. "I Work in a Prison." North Carolina Libraries. 43 (Fall 1985): 158-159.

Coyle, William. Libraries in Prisons: A Blending of Institutions. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

_____. "Reforming Prison Libraries." Library Journal. 114 (October 1989): 66-67.

Dickey, Walter J. "The Importance of Libraries in Corrections." Wisconsin Library Bulletin. 79 (Spring 1984): 30-31.

Drewett, Donald A. "Prison Programs and Library Services." The Bookmark. 44 (Winter 1986): 112-113.

Gholston, Betty J. and Lancaster, P.T. "A Prison's Library -- A Look Inside." North Carolina Libraries. 43 (Fall 1985): 160-161.

Gordon, Barbara. "Correctional Librarians: Providing Services By the Book." Corrections Today. (Dec. 1989): 60-64.

Gulker, Virgil. Books Behind Bars. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Hardie, Susan H. "Oregon's Jail and Prison Libraries: Is Rehabilitation Possible?" PNLA Quarterly. 53 (Summer 1989): 5-6.

Hartz, Fred R. "Prison Libraries -- the Realities." Catholic Library World. 59 (May/June 1988): 258-261.

Hartz, Fred, Krimmel, Michael B., and Hartz, Emilie K. Prison Librarianship: A Selective, Annotated, Classified Bibliography, 1945-1985. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1987.

Haymann-Diaz, Barbara. "Establishing a Selection Process Model for an Ethnic Collection in a Prison Library." Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian. 8:1/2 (1989): 33-49.

Holbert, Cornelia. "Feet Off the Circulation Desk." The Bookmark. 38 (Winter 1979): 95-98.

Ihrig, Jay M. "La Biblioteca: Myth or Reality for the Hispanic Inmate." Hispanic Books Bulletin. 1:4 (1988): 11-13.

Johnson, Mike and Morris, Sandra. "Organizing and Establishing a Prison Library." North Carolina Libraries. 43 (Fall 1985): 151-155.

Krantz, Sheldon. The Law of Corrections and Prisoners' Rights in a Nutshell. 2d ed. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing, 1983.

Lefebvre, Joanne. "Lone Librarian Behind Bars: Courses Offer Hope to Inmates." Canadian Library Journal. 45 (April 1988): 84-89.

Locke, Joanne and Galler, Anne, M.I. "Innovative Prison Project: Breaking Out With Books." Canadian Library Journal. 45 (April 1988): 77-81.

Lopez-Cortada, J.G. and Van Schlegelmann, V.E. Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Prisons but Could Not Find Out. Lyons, Georgia: Rue Chien Press, 1983.

Mallinger, Stephen. "Games Inmates Play." Corrections Today. 53 (Dec. 1991): 188-92.

MacDonald, Susan (ed.). "Acquisitions for Prison Libraries: A Selected Bibliography, by David Allan Coe, and a Response, by Christine L. Kirby." Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory. 7:1 (1983): 29-33.

Michaud, John. "Finding the Line." North Carolina Libraries. 43 (Fall 1985): 156-157.

Mitchell, Z. Oreada. "No Street Address." Colorado Libraries. 16 (December 1990): 22-23.

Mongelli, William. "Giraffes, School Buses, and Prison Librarianship, or 'Why Did You Move Hundreds of Miles Away to Buy a Car, Bill?'." The Unabashed Librarian. 73 (1989): 19-20.

Penney, Darby. "Collection Development in Prison Libraries." CLIC Quarterly. 3 (June 1984): 36-45.

Pool, Jane. "Library Services to Correctional Facilities." Catholic Library World. 56 (April 1985): 387-389.

Roberts, Katherine M. "A View Between the Bars: A Look at the Fremont Correctional Facility Library," Colorado Libraries. 16 (Dec. 1990): 49-50.

Rubin, Rhea Joyce and Souza, Sandra J. "The Challenge Continues: Prison Librarianship in the 1980's." Library Journal. 114 (March 1 1989): 47-51.

Samenow, Stanton E. Inside the Criminal Mind. New York: Times Books, 1984.

Sawyer, Michael. "Automation Goes to Prison." Computers in Libraries. 9 (March, 1989): 4-10.

_____. "Inmates Do Ask Questions: Automation and Reference Service In a Correctional Setting." Reference Services Review. 17 (Winter 1989): 49-54+.

_____. "I Know What's Best for you: Censorship in Prison." Ohio Libraries. 4:2 (1991): 8-11.

Souza, Sandra. "Real Libraries . . . Real Librarians." Wilson Library Bulletin. 64 (Oct. 1989): 37-38.

Suvak, Daniel. Memoirs of American Prisons: An Annotated Bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1979.

_____. "Throw the Book at 'Em: The Change-Based Model for Prison Libraries." Wilson Library Bulletin. 64 (October 1989) 31-33.

Walker, Alice. "Working: Librarians in Prisons." Ohio Libraries. 2 (Nov/Dec 1989): 24.